

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/591,986	09/07/2006	Ryuji Ueno	Q80545	9326	
23373 SUGHRUE M	7590 07/09/200 ION PLLC	EXAM	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYL VANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON. DC 20037			THOMAS,	THOMAS, TIMOTHY P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
***************************************	71, DC 20057		1614	•	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SUGHRUE@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/591,986	UENO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
TIMOTHY P. THOMAS	1614	

		TIMOTHY P. THOMAS	1614				
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -							
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after 50.00 (MONTH's from the mailing date of the communication. Failure to exply within the set or extended period for reply will by statistic, cause the application to become ABADONED (38 U.S.C, § 133). Any reply received by the Office laster has three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned pattern term adulations.							
Status							
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Mi. This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro		merits is			
Disposition of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati- ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National \$	Stage			
Attachmen	it(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				

- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5/05)

 - Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/20/2008.

- Paper No(s)/Mail Date.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 10/591,986 Page 2

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- Applicants' arguments, filed 6/20/2008, have been fully considered but they are
 not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous
 office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are
 either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being
 applied to the instant application.
- Applicant's arguments, see pp. 10-11, filed 6/20/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-7 under 35 USC 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as follows.
- 3. The rejection is withdrawn due to the claim amendments removing sugar as additive specie, on which the rejection was based. The rejections that follow are necessitated by the amendment to the claims and the introduction of new claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Application/Control Number: 10/591,986 Page 3

Art Unit: 1614

Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

 Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over lnoue, et al. (WO 2004/067521 A1; priority date 2003 Jan 27; IDS 3/30/2007 reference) and Ogata et al. (US 4,780,465; 1988).

This rejection is necessitated by the claim amendments and the addition of new claims 8-10. Inoue teaches compounds of formula (I) (p. 4, starting line 26), including the elected compound (p. 8, lines 31-32); solutions and suspensions (p. 27, line 33—p. 28, line 1), and aqueous parenteral solutions (contains water) and suspensions, which may contain additives, such as saline or glucose, to make solutions isotonic (p. 28, lines 5, 7-12). Inoue does not teach the elected compound, in an aquoues solution with glycerin, mannitol or boric acid. Ogata teaches NaCl, glycerin, mannitol, boric acid and glucose are isotonic agents for aqueous solutions (col.3, Table I). It would have been

Application/Control Number: 10/591,986 Page 4

Art Unit: 1614

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute any one of glycerin, mannitol, or boric acid for glucose in the aqueous parenteral solutions taught by Inoue as isotonic agents. The motivation would have been the art-recognized equivalence of the compounds for the purpose of adjusting isotonic strength of the aqueous solutions.

Conclusion

- No claim is allowed.
- Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY P. THOMAS whose telephone number is Application/Control Number: 10/591,986

Art Unit: 1614

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{(571)272-8994. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 a.m.}$

- 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy P Thomas/ Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/Ardin Marschel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614